

### REMARKS

Claims 1-52 are pending in the application prior to entering this amendment.

The Examiner indicates allowable claims 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 17, 18, 20-22, 24, 25, 30, 31, 33-35, 37, 38, 43, 44, 46-48, 50 and 51 if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the corresponding base claim and any intervening claims.

The examiner rejects claims 1, 3, 6, 14, 16, 19, 27, 29, 32, 40, 42 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Iwama (US 2003/0235187). The examiner rejects claims 2, 10, 13, 15, 23, 26, 28, 36, 39, 41, 49 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwama in view of Kato (US Patent No. 6,940,819).

The Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 20, 23, 24, 27, 28, 30, 33, 36, 37, 40, 41, 43, 46, 49 and 50.

Claims 1-52 remain in the application after entering this amendment.

The Applicant adds no new matter and requests reconsideration of all remaining claims.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102*

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3, 6, 14, 16, 19, 27, 29, 32, 40, 42 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(3) as being anticipated by Iwama (US 2003/0235187).

The Applicant traverses the rejection, however the Applicant amends claims 1, 14, 27, and 40 to further clarify the subject matter and to facilitate bringing this case to allowance.

Claim 1 recites a processor adapted to analyze the reply message for inclusion of an attribute of a called device associated with the connection session and infer from the reply message the attribute that is not included in the reply message.

Iwama does not infer from the reply message an attribute that is not included in the reply message, rather Iwama discloses a gatekeeper that extracts information for the called device from an attribute management table 1605 on the basis of the extracted called number S902 and transmits the called device address to the calling device. Similarly, information associated with the extracted called number S902 is not inferred from a reply message from the *called* device, but rather is extracted from the address inquiry signal sent from the *calling* device (page 11, par. 0117).

Furthermore, Iwama does not analyze the reply message for inclusion of an attribute of the called device associated with the connection session because, as discussed above, such an attribute is instead extracted from the attribute management table 1605 or the address inquiry signal.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The Examiner rejects claims 2, 10, 13, 15, 23, 26, 28, 36, 39, 41, 49 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwama (US 2003/0235187) in view of Kato (US Patent No. 6,940,819).

The Applicant traverses the rejection, however the Applicant amends claims 2, 10, 15, 23, 28, 36, 41 and 49 to further clarify the subject matter and to facilitate bringing this case to allowance. The Applicant disagrees that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to infer a codec type of the device that is not included in the reply message. Neither of the referenced art discloses inferring a codec type or suggests that it would be advantageous to do so. Furthermore, claims 2, 15, 28, 41 depend on amended independent claims as previously discussed, and therefore include all the limitations of the independent claims.

The Applicant has amended independent claim 10 to recite a processor wherein a calling device infers from the reply message an identify of the second port.

Neither Iwama nor Kato disclose identifying a second port in this manner. One advantage of this invention is that the processor does not need to transmit information to the device regarding which port will receive data. In this manner, smaller or fewer messages may be exchanged between the processor and the device and result in faster data transmission rates, for example. Similarly, the processor is not required to access a table or database to determine the identity of the port. These aspects of the invention and their advantages are not disclosed or suggested in the referenced art. The combination of Kato's ports and Iwana's TCP port identification fails to render the recited invention obvious because even if they are combined they fail to teach the particular configuration that is recited.

Amended independent claims 23, 36, and 49 are allowable for the same or similar reasons as described above for claim 10.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

The Examiner has objected to claims 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 17-18, 20-22, 24, 25, 30-31, 33-35, 37, 38, 43, 44, 46-48, 50 and 51 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but has indicated that they otherwise describe allowable subject matter.

Accordingly, the Applicant amends claims 4, 7, 11, 17, 20, 24, 30, 33, 37, 43, 46 and 50 to be rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims. Claims 5, 8, 9, 12, 18, 21, 22, 25, 31, 34, 35, 38, 44, 47, 48 therefore depend from the rewritten, independent claims. These objected-to claims are now considered to be in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-52 of the application as amended. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Bryan D. Kirkpatrick  
Reg. No. 53,135

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400  
Portland, OR 97204  
503-222-3613

Customer No. 20575